DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 804 95 EA 008 365

AUTHOR Goldman, Paul; Gregory, Sundra
TITLE Instituting PPBS in Schools: A Comparison of Two Districts.
INSTITUTION Oregon Univ., Eugene. Center for Educational Policy and Management.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 1 Apr 76
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adoption (Ideas); Case Studies (Education); *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Management Systems; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Planning Programming Budgeting System; PPBS

ABSTRACT

Teacher reaction to the institution of a planning-programming-budgeting system (PPBS) was surveyed through a structured but open-ended interview in two school districts. Results showed that the mere introduction of new bureaucratic documents for completion by teachers generated only mild negative reaction and no real sense that teacher autonomy was threatened. The highly participative implementation style in one district generated new enthusiasm and work patterns while the administrative decision-making style in the other engendered indifference to the innovation. The system was seen as curriculum-oriented in the former and management-oriented in the latter. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

7.19 F

ED123804

INSTITUTING PPBS IN SCHOOLS: A COMPARISON OF TWO DISTRICTS

by

Paul Goldman
and
Sundra Gregory

Center for Educational Policy and Management
University of Oregon

April 1, 1976

AUTHORS' NOTE: The authors wish to acknowledge the support of the Research and Development Division, Center for Educational Policy and Management during a portion of the time they devoted to the preparation of this paper. The Center for Educational Policy and Management is funded under a contract with National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The research reported in this paper was conducted as part of the research and development of the Center. Any opinions expressed in this report, however, do not necessarily reflect those of CEPM, nor do they necessarily represent the policies or positions of the National Institute of Education. No official endorsement should be inferred from either source.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 008 365

The recent interest in planning-programming-budgeting systems (PPBS) among school administrators is occasioned by three perceived needs: the rationalization of costs in a time of tight school budgets, the standardization of instructional priorities on a district-wide or state-wide basis, and the establishment of a coherent standard of public accountability. To meet these needs numerous school-based PPBS have been developed in university schools of education, in research institutes, and in school districts themselves. These systems place new demands on administrators and teachers, and the responses of educators to this, as well as any other, innovation will vary depending on prior orientations, styles of work, and the manner in which the program is brought into the routine life of the school or district. In this paper we hope to show how the differing responses of teachers in two school districts to the same PPBS were based on vastly different modes of "managing the innovation."

The Theoretical Issues

The institution of PPBS in schools raises two infrequently joined theoretical issues in the literature on the sociology of educational organization: (1) the impact of increased bureaucratization on teacher attitudes and (2) teacher responses to innovation in general. This connection exists because of the primarily administrative and bureaucratic nature of PPBS itself. PPBS generally requires increases in both the quantity of written documentation and in the standardization of that documentation. For example, the system instituted in the two districts we studied incorporated not only a complex budgeting and flowchart format for administrators, but four sets of forms to be completed by teachers. These included the specifying of objectives on a

yearly and unit basis, the planning of instruction for both time periods, the recording of pupil performance, and the summarizing of program information and data. Additional forms were provided for teachers and/or administrators to summarize building or grade level data. While teachers traditionally prepare part of this information in their lesson plans and gradebooks, and while many establish written long-term and short-term objectives, most do not set it forth in such detail. An innovation of this type differs substantially from the more typical innovations in education which tend to be primarily pedagogic such as open classroom techniques, new or improved teaching methods of instruction in skill areas, and teaching the culturally, physically, or emotionally disadvantaged (Gross, et al., 1971; Miles, 1964).

Research on teacher attitudes towards bureaucratization is extensive. Findings generally have shown an inverse relationship between the extent and specificity of formal rules and procedures on the one hand and teacher autonomy and satisfaction on the other. This overall trend, however, requires considerable qualification. Cosine and Keith (1970), MacKay (1966), and Ratsoy (1973) all found that teachers perceiving their schools as highly bureaucratized were less satisfied in their jobs than those who did not. A logical extension of these findings is seen in the research of Anderson (1968), Corwin (1970), Gordon (1957), and Muth (1972) who have shown a direct relationship between bureaucratization and organizational conflict within the school. Both sets of findings suggest that externally imposed regulations may impinge on the teachers' sense of their own professionalism and may encourage them to assert their perceived rights more forcefully (Lortie, 1969; 1975). This process may involve both interpersonal tension between teachers and administrators and more vigorous activity through their teachers' association. PPBS has

had this effect in at least one district (Goldman and Gregory 1975).

Nonetheless, in using teacher perceptions as the indicator of bureaucracy, these studies may tease out the effects of rule enforcement rather than rule existence and thus contaminate the results. At times teachers feel more secure with formalized rules if they believe those rules protect them from arbitrary authority (Moeller, 1962). Moreover, the individual teacher attitudes toward bureaucratization in schools often reflect individual or group differences in teaching style and training. Corwin (1970), Gosine and Keith (1970), and Grassie and Carss (1973) have all published findings indicating that only the more "professionalized" "independent" teachers are highly dissatisfied with highly bureaucratized schools. While we would anticipate negative reactions to PPBS from teachers, varying reactions may well be determined by the comparative distribution of those holding "professional" versus "employee" orientations (for which, unfortunately, we have no data).

A second strand of the literature on educational organizations indeed--on organizations of all types--deals with the relationship between the way in which an innovation is brought into the school setting and teacher reactions. Since Coch and French's (1948) landmark study, organizational research has invariably shown that innovations in which workers have had a say in the method of implementation are far better received than those imposed by higher authority (Bennis, et al, 1969: Leavitt, 1965). This tendency can be explained on both practical and psychological grounds. The best guarantee that an innovation will meet teachers' needs is for them to have a role in adapting and modifying it to the particular requirements of carrying on instruction in their *own* school setting. Thus, they can tailor the innovation to their own styles of teaching. At the same time, personal and collective involvement in the decision-

making process sustains their professional identity while the imposition of new procedures by building or district administrators undermines it. This consideration is particularly pressing because an innovation such as PPBS is particularly sensitive for teachers since it (1) is geared to administrative rather than pedagogic needs, (2) potentially encourages more complete yet more distant evaluation, (3) cannot be adopted on a voluntary basis but must be school-wide to be effective, (4) goes against the educational philosophy of many educators (Levin, 1974), and (5) involves more routine paperwork that may not immediately or even necessarily result in improved instruction.

Receptivity to innovation in general, however, is often dependent on the organizational context and the degree to which teachers are able and willing to cooperatively work with one another to develop and sustain new techniques. In studying the adoption of programmed instruction, as Carlson (1965) notes that a chain reaction process may occur and serve to increase the level of individual use and acceptance of the innovation. Our earlier research on the adoption of PPBS suggests that teacher acceptance of the same innovation within the same school district differed widely between schools because in some schools an esprit de corps developed around the system and in others it did not (Goldman and Gregory, 1975). It is interesting that the very characteristic that inclines teachers to resist bureaucratization, a strong professional orientation, at the same time is often associated with a high degree of receptivity to innovation (Corwin, 1975; Giacquinta, 1975). The unproven but plausible logic behind this finding is that highly professionalized, highly trained teachers have the capacity for high levels of adaptability and flexibility, but this capacity will be exercised only in the pursuit of goals deemed to be worthwhile.

The Schools

Hamilton School District is located in an upper middle class suburb of a major east coast city. Its three thousand students in grades K-6 are taught by 150 teachers in five schools. Kennedy School, the site chosen by administrators to pilot test PPBS in the district, was opened in Fall, 1974 with thirty-one teachers and about six hundred students. The choice of Kennedy as the experimental school was taken after serious consideration. Administrators felt that a new school, without an established network of roles and expectations, would provide a desirable situation in which to begin an innovative program. They felt that the development of PPBS could grow as the school did and become fully integrated with the emerging social reality constructed by the faculty. During the course of that first year, however, the district faced unexpected budgetary hardships and was forced to conclude that they would be unable to continue using the PPBS at Kennedy or expand as planned into the district's other four schools. While both district administrators and Kennedy's principal were determined to carry out the program through the 1974-1975 year, the knowledge that the program would be phased out after the initial year may have had some effect on faculty attitudes.

White Pine School District is located in a major western mining community. Unlike Hamilton, White Pine is responsible for teaching youngsters from grades K-12 in its twenty-one schools. It is much larger than Hamilton with almost ten thousand enrolled students. Two small schools were selected to pilot the PPBS, one with seven and one with nine teachers.* In both cases the choice

---

* Teacher reactions and attitudes in both schools were so similar that we have lumped the two schools together for purposes of discussion and data presentation.

resulted from an overwhelming willingness on the part of teachers to take part in the experimental program. District administrators were strongly committed to developing a system-wide PPBS and delegated an assistant superintendent to coordinate activities in the two schools. He was expected to work closely with teachers and was given release time to spend a month at a nearby university to work with the developers of the particular PPBS to be used in White Pine.

Data Collection

Teachers and administrators in both Hamilton and White Pine were interviewed in May, 1975 as the first year of PPBS use was coming to a close. Both authors plus three other interviewers administered an open-ended survey questionnaire asking school faculty their initial impressions of the PPBS, their actual activities related to the program, and their current attitudes. Teachers were asked to complete a brief self-administered questionnaire. Interviews were taped and then transcribed to allow us to establish categories and then code the data appropriately.

A very high response rate was obtained in both districts. Twenty-eight of the thirty-one teachers at Kennedy were willing to be interviewed, as was the principal and both the school superintendent and business manager of Hamilton District. In White Pine all of the sixteen involved teachers, the two principals, and four district administrators including the superintendent were interviewed. Administrators were interviewed using a slightly different interview schedule than teachers so that their different concerns could be addressed. In aggregating and presenting the data we have relied on simple frequencies since we are primarily interested in comparing the direct

responses of teachers in the two districts. These responses were sufficiently different that complex statistical techniques, even had they been possible with such a small population of involved faculty, did not seem warranted.

Results and Discussion

In looking at teacher reactions to PPBS we will focus on initial impressions, the process of implementation, problems and benefits specific to each district, and teachers' views of the consequences of the program for their jobs. Teachers in both districts learned about the possibility that they would be moving to a PPBS program during the year prior to the initial implementation. Administrators had been "shopping" for a PPBS because of their interest in such programs and their perception that their State Boards of Education and State Legislatures would (and should) mandate more effective accountability systems for the schools. In White Pine a number of meetings with teachers were held to assess and stimulate their interest. It was hoped, justifiably as it turned out, that support would be sufficiently strong in at least a few schools. Workshops with outside PPBS experts were held in order to familiarize the staff with both the philosophy and the day-to-day routines involved in such programs.

Teachers were allowed to vote on whether the program was to be accepted and were given the choice as to whether they would individually implement PPBS in their classroom. They decided collectively that the first year's efforts would be devoted to piloting PPBS in mathematics. Teachers had some sense that the decision was not entirely in their hands: eight of the sixteen teachers did not feel that they "personally had a role in the decision to adopt" and six felt some pressure to adopt the program in their own classes. But the pressure was apparently not unpleasant and their acquiescence incorporated

the desire to support the administration towards which they had predominantly positive feelings.

At Kennedy the decision to implement was made by district officials and the principal of the new school. No teacher mentioned having a role in the decision-making process and teachers were not given a choice in whether or not they would use PPBS forms in their classes. Teachers at Kennedy were given the vote on which instructional program would be joined to PPBS. The overwhelming initial desire was to start with math, but through what was seen as a manipulative process on the part of the principal, reading was actually chosen. This occasioned some initial resentment.

Despite the apparent differences between the two districts, initial impressions of PPBS were quite similar as we can see in Table 1. White Pine teachers were slightly more favorable when first looking at the program but the most interesting aspect of the results is the very high percentage of teachers in both areas--over 80%--who apparently did not have strong feelings about PPBS. This indicates that a healthy majority were willing to give the program a try. Reactions to the way in which the program was brought into the schools differed markedly between areas. In White Pine there was a sense of choice, especially as regards the individual decision to implement. One teacher commented as follows: "We as a school voted whether we wanted to go for PPBS....and we didn't have to do it if we didn't want to." Teachers at Kennedy had different feelings. Typical responses were, "I was given no choice at all," and "It was forced on us."

The day-to-day process of using PPBS also differed between the two districts. In addition to the aftereffects of the decision-making process each district had one characteristic that distinguished it from the other and almost

certainly had an effect on the overall reaction to the program. In White Pine, the administrator assigned to work directly with the program was constantly in contact with teachers and consistently helped them with their problems. His popularity and effort closed the gap between teachers and the central administration and helped to develop a strong sense of solidarity. This solidarity included the principals, and informal comments stressed that the principals and teachers worked more closely and comfortably than ever before.

Potential tensions were lessened by administrator commitment to aid the teaching faculty in developing more effective programs and the lack of any intention to use completed documents as a source of teacher evaluation. As one principal put it, "I have some documents. But I haven't really scrutinized them. I feel these are for the teachers' information and if I spend a lot of time going over them they would feel threatened--which I don't want." In general, administrators saw themselves as supporting personnel, and even suggestions for modification were undertaken in a spirit of cooperativeness and flexibility. The effectiveness of this approach can be seen in responses to the last two items in Table 2. We should note, however, that both schools are extremely small. The comparative freedom which administrators had from heavy bureaucratic demands was instrumental in allowing them to work so effectively with teachers on PPBS.

At Kennedy a major issue was the lack of fit between PPBS documents and the school-wide Houghton-Mifflin reading series that was used there. The teacher's manual for the series itself was highly structured, and teachers were thus required to complete two different forms with overlapping data. Most of the teachers, while feeling that the PPBS forms were well organized and concise, complained about too much paperwork. Almost ninety percent of

the Kennedy teachers felt that PPBS took too much of their time (see item 7, Table 2), and half of them felt that preparation of reading instruction took them longer than before. The mean difference for those teachers was an additional 2.3 hours a week over and above the 3.3 they had previously spent.

While perhaps less attuned to teachers' perceived needs that the White Pine administrators, the Kennedy principal was aware of the problems experienced by teachers. She felt a need for a coordinator who could devote considerable time to the program without mixing supervisory and advisory powers. At the same time she was very concerned with directing and guiding the instructional program and was anxious to be on top of what was going on in the classroom. This orientation concerned a curricular rather than an evaluation-based approach. She felt that PPBS was not appropriate for holding teachers accountable for their productivity. She met with each teacher several times during the course of the school year and most of the latter felt that the purpose was program-related rather than evaluation-related.

The results presented in Table 2 overwhelmingly show the differential preferences of teachers in the two districts. Reactions to the utility of PPBS for teacher, for student learning, and school environment differ so markedly that it is difficult to appreciate that, with only minor variations, the same program was used in both locations. There is an obvious halo effect in that teachers seem to be responding as much to the <u>form</u> of the innovation as to its <u>content</u> and as much to the entire context as to any specific policy. It is very clear that the apparent success of PPBS in White Pine, further indicated by the spontaneous decisions of many teachers to expand its use beyond math, is due to an atmosphere where acceptance of the program and group solidarity is the norm. The administrative input and energy have contributed to

the esprit de corps found there. On the other hand, that energy might not continue indefinitely or necessarily be extendable to other schools in White Pine.

At Kennedy, PPBS faced too many obstacles for us to expect a successful implementation of the innovation. The general pressure to organize school life in a new building precluded the special nursing along that PPBS apparently requires. Most of the teachers did not know either each other or the principal well enough for established leadership to effectively guide the program. The traces of resentment at the manner in which decisions were made regarding PPBS may have lessened commitment. And, finally, when the need to phase out the program became known in mid-year, teachers felt no real need to adapt their teaching style to the requirements of PPBS.

Before concluding that White Pine represents a model of how innovations should be instituted and Hamilton a model of mistake and misfortune, one other issue might be raised. The critical difference between the two districts seems to be in the general approach of each towards PPBS as an educational tool. In White Pine administrators perceived the program, at least as it affected teachers, as a curricular system that would help teachers better organize their instructional efforts. They communicated, by word and deed, this perception to teachers who began to see it in the same light. The release-time and college credit granted teachers for working on the system helped them think of skills in dealing with PPBS as part of their professional development. By contrast, administrators in Hamilton see PPBS as a predominantly management system, a tendency far more typical of the PPBS literature. In becoming aware of this orientation, teachers may have come to resent the program as one that required them to devote a substantial amount of time and energy without necessarily improving the quality of their teaching.

Conclusions

The study of the differential reaction to PPBS in two relatively small-scale school settings has implications for the implementation of similar data-based accountability systems elsewhere. Already PPBS has aroused wide interest and controversy in the educational community and, in some cases, has been strongly resisted by teachers (Kirst, 1975). Some tentative lessons can be drawn from the research described above. Already overworked teachers, while doubtless not overly excited about systems that increase their paperwork and preparation time, will accept them under certain conditions. The essential requirement seems to be that bureaucratized procedures can be incorporated into schools if teachers maintain some control over both the process and the product, and if they see such procedures as directed towards their problems and needs. While the literature on conditions under which innovations are routinized is sustained by this research, the very nature of PPBS and those administrators who are enthusiastic about it makes us feel that the combination of factors existing in White Pine might be a rare occurrence. If PPBS is to be successful in schools in the future, and not just encourage ritualistic completion of forms, it will have to do so by serving larger administrative purposes only through effectively serving teachers' needs.

TABLE 1

TEACHERS' INITIAL REACTIONS TO PPBS

	Very Favorable	Somewhat Favorable	Indifferent	Somewhat Unfavorable	Very Unfavorable	N
Kennedy	4%	39%	21%	29%	7%	27
White Pine	13	56	13	13	6	16

TABLE 2

CONSEQUENCES OF PPBS FOR TEACHERS

Per Cent Answering 'Yes'

	Kennedy	White Pine
Teaching		
1. My instruction is more individualized	37%	88%
2. My planning of an entire course is improved	29	100
3. My goals and objectives are better coordinated with those of other teachers	22	93
4. There is more interaction between me and individual students	26	81
5. There is less room for spontaneity in my daily teaching	38	13
6. Teaching has become more difficult	36	0
7. PPBS takes too much time	86	14
Student Learning		
8. I can better measure and evaluate student learning	50	100
9. Student achievement is higher in PPBS-organized courses than it used to be	8	75
10. It is easier to report progress to parents	43	100
School Environment		
11. PPBS causes more tension between the teaching staff and the administration	74	6
12. Morale of teachers has generally improved as a consequence of PPBS	7	88
N	28	16

Bibliography

Anderson, James G.
1968 Bureaucracy in Education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Bennis, Warren G., Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin (eds.).
1969 The Planning of Change. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Carlson, Richard O.
1965 Adoption of Educational Innovations. Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Coch, L., and J.R.P. French
1948 "Overcoming Resistance to Change," Human Relations, 1, pp. 512-532.

Corwin, Ronald G.
1970 Militant Professionalism: A Study of Organizational Conflict in High Schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

_____.
1975 "Innovation in Organizations: The Case of Schools," Sociology of Education, 48 (Winter), pp. 1-37.

Giacquinta, Joseph B.
1975 "Status, Risk, and Receptivity to Innovations in Complex Organizations: A Study of the Responses of Four Groups of Educators to the Proposed Introduction of Sex Education in Elementary School," Sociology of Education, 48 (Winter), pp. 38-58.

Goldman, Paul and Sundra Gregory
1975 "PPBS and Teachers: Responses to an Educational Innovation." Paper presented at the Pacific Sociological Association Meetings, Victoria, British Columbia.

Gordon, C. Wayne.
1957 The Social System of the High School: A Study in the Sociology of Adolescence. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Gosine, M. and M.V. Keith.
1970 "Bureaucracy, Teacher Personality Needs and Teacher Satisfaction," The Canadian Administrator, X: No. 1.

Grassie, McCrae C. and Brian W. Carss.
1973 "School Structure, Leadership Quality and Teacher Satisfaction." Educational Administration Quarterly, IX, pp. 15-26.

Gross, Neal, Joseph Giacquinta, and Marilyn Bernstein.
1971 Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Change. New York: Basic Books.

Kirst, Michael.
1974 "The Rise and Fall of PPBS in California," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI, pp. 535-8.

Leavitt, Harold J.
1965 "Applied Organizational Change in Industry: Structural, Technological, and Humanistic Approaches," in James March, Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand, McNally.

Levin, Henry M.
1974 "A Conceptual Framework for Accountability in Education," School Review, pp. 363-91.

Lortie, Dan C.
1969 "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. Amatai Etzioni, (ed.). New York: The Free Press.

_____.
1975 Schoolteacher: A Sociological Analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MacKay, David A.
1966 "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relations to Other Characteristics of School Organizations." University of Alberta, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Miles, Matthew B., (ed.).
1964 Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Moeller, Gerald H.
1962 "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power," Administrator's Notebook, X, p. 1.

Muth, Rodney.
1972 "Teacher Perceptions of Power, Conflict and Consensus," Administrator's Notebook, XXI.

Ratsoy, Eugene W.
1973 "Participative and Hierarchical Management of Schools: Some Emerging Generalizations," Journal of Educational Administration, XI, pp. 161-70.